

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 446

SO 012 113

AUTHOR Shaver, James F.  
TITLE The NSF Studies of Status of Pre-Collegiate Education: Implications for Social Studies Professors and Curriculum Developers.  
PUB DATE 20 Nov 79  
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Portland, OR, November 20, 1979); For a related document, see SO 012 084  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*College Teachers; \*Curriculum Development; \*Educational Needs; Educational Practice; Educational Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; \*Public School Teachers; Relevance (Education); \*Social Studies; \*Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education

## ABSTRACT

The necessity for social studies professors and curriculum developers to recognize the reality of teacher attitudes and classroom situations is discussed. The author contends that teachers are not very reflective about what they teach and about the effect of their teaching on students. This lack of introspection can be traced to teacher education programs. Part of the problem is that teachers are trained to be teachers prior to their gaining experience as teachers. A suggestion is to spend less time in preservice education by preparing would-be teachers for the minimal requirements of lesson planning and classroom management. The emphasis on teaching techniques, curriculum methods, and philosophy would be reserved for inservice teachers. Other conflicts between (1) social studies teachers and (2) professors and curriculum developers are a result of the focus of both groups. Social studies professors and developers tend to focus on conceptual structures which will excite, interest, and develop independent thinking. Teachers focus on how to control and manage students. Also, conflict results from the democratic mandate for both stability and progress. Social studies teachers, members of a community in which values of conformity dominate, gravitate toward stability, while university professors advocate teaching controversial issues. It is important to pay attention to the social system in which the teacher operates and the reality of the setting in which teaching occurs. (Author/KC)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James P.  
Shaver

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT  
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE NSF STUDIES OF STATUS OF PRE-COLLEGIATE  
EDUCATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL STUDIES PROFESSORS  
AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPERS

By James P. Shaver  
Utah State University

Paper prepared for a College and University Faculty Assembly symposium,  
The NSF and RAND Reports: Implications for the Social Studies, at the  
Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Portland,  
Oregon, November 20, 1979.

ED178446

SØ 012 113

THE NSF STUDIES OF STATUS OF PRE-COLLEGIATE EDUCATION:  
IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL STUDIES PROFESSORS AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPERS\*

James P. Shaver  
Utah State University

By now, the existence of the National Science Foundation-sponsored studies of the status of pre-collegiate mathematics, science, and social studies/social science education (Hegelson, Blosser & Howe, 1977; Stake & Easley, 1978; Suydam & Osborne, 1977; Weiss, 1978; Wiley, 1977) is, I assume, well-known among CUFA members. Also, I assume that CUFA members are generally familiar with the interpretive report on the NSF studies which O.L. Davis, Jr., Suzanne Helburn, and I (1978, 1979) prepared as a National Council for the Social Studies task force. Consequently, I will not review those documents but discuss some thoughts stemming from my reading and contemplation of them.

Working on the NSF interpretive report was for me one of those instances where a professional experience has a significant effect on one's own professional views. The NSF reports raised perplexing and unsettling issues--some of which I have touched on elsewhere (Shaver, 1978, in press). It might be more appropriate to say the work surfaced some issues which had been latent in my thinking as a result of years of working in the public schools as a curriculum consultant, inservice instructor, and as a teacher at both the junior high and senior high levels, as well as from a largely abortive effort, in one of the last of the "New Social Studies" (NSS) projects of the 1960's (Shaver & Larkins, 1969), to get into social studies classrooms materials that would help students learn to analyze public issues.

---

\*Paper prepared for a College and University Faculty Assembly symposium, The NSF and RAND Reports: Implications for the Social Studies, at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Portland, Oregon, November 20, 1979.

Organizing my thoughts for this symposium has been extremely difficult. One reason is that trying to do so has forced me to recognize more explicitly that some of the issues raised by the NSF findings and my own past experiences are not entirely clear, much less resolved, in my own mind. There has been another difficulty. Trying to step back to look at one's self is never an easy task; self-examination is not only onerous, but threatening. And that is what many of the findings from the NSF report, and our (Shaver, Davis, Helburn, 1978, 1979) interpretations of the findings, call for--an intensive re-examination, careful analysis and re-evaluation, of the role of social studies professors and curriculum developers.

Given that thrust and my difficulties in grappling with all the related issues, this paper is not so much a carefully reasoned academic document as it is a sharing of some thoughts--not quite random, but not well-formulated and structured either. What I want to do is share some thinking out loud, rather than present a position statement. So, as I ruminate, I hope to maintain a tone of reflection, not proclamation; and I urge the listener (reader) to keep that perspective in mind as a corrective for my own lapses in intent.

Analytic introspection is not particularly popular among one's peers; or, at least, so the reactions to my critique of the social studies profession in my NCSS presidential address (Shaver, 1977a) have indicated to me. So, I reiterate here, as I stated there, but without much hope of softening the responses, that if I should raise questions about the efficacy of social studies professors and curriculum developers, about their lack of realism in viewing their own past and future contributions, and about the likelihood that they will significantly influence social studies education in the

mass of public schools in the future, I do not exclude myself from the comments.

#### National Curriculum Projects?

I am often asked about the implications of the NSF findings for national curriculum development projects. In fact, such questions have particular poignancy for me--as a person who was involved in one of the first of the "New Social Studies" projects (the Harvard Project, Oliver & Shaver, 1974), which has had a fair amount of acclaim from professors and other curriculum developers, as well as from some teachers, but which has probably not had a broad effect on schooling; as well as a person who was involved in one of the last of the NSS projects (the Utah State University project referred to above) from which the materials (Shaver & Larkins, 1973-74), after considerable praise from those who attend NCSS meetings and read educational journals, were not much used in public schools. I have frequently pondered those results and what they might mean for those of us in the role of social studies specialist. Were those efforts of the 1960's doomed to failure from the beginning (at least in terms of the use of materials and techniques by teachers), or did we simply approach our work insensitively, with too little appreciation for the magnitude of the task? The rest of this paper speaks, if somewhat tangentially, to that question.

A specific question often asked of me is whether social studies professors and other curriculum developers should continue to devote effort to developing national curricula--that is, developing curricula with the intent that they be disseminated for use in schools across the country. To some extent, it is an empty question, given the current lack of government or foundation funding for such projects. One might, of course, ask whether professors and developers should not be mustering influence to have such funding

reinstated.

In light of the low use and apparently low impact of the NSS projects, the unavailability of funding for national curriculum projects is probably wise. Wiley (1977) has suggested that even though low percentages of teachers appear to have used the NSS materials in their classrooms, their effect may have been considerable, because of indirect influences on the conventional textbooks that continue to dominate social studies instruction. Few systematic studies of textbook content have been done to determine if NSS-influenced shifts in content and/or orientation did occur (Wiley, 1977). However, Schneider and Van Sickle (1979) indicate, based on publishers' perceptions, that "if the traditional patterns of social studies curriculum and instruction underwent dramatic change in the late 1960's and early 1970's, then clearly there has been retrenchment" (p. 464).

In any event, the important question is not whether textbook content or orientation has changed, but whether, even if such change occurred, there has been a difference generally in the experiences of students in social studies classes. The answer to that appears to be, no. Clearly, inquiry materials can be used in very non-inquiry ways. According to the NSF reports, high percentages of teachers indicated they needed assistance if they were to change their teaching methods to fit inquiry models. That need is not surprising in light of the lack of inquiry teaching models to which prospective teachers are exposed from kindergarten through their bachelor degrees, and even in graduate school. And, the situation holds true in areas other than social studies. For example, Moore (1978) has noted that the inquiry materials of the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study were taught in conventional, non-inquiry ways by teachers who, even in college, had not had a science course "that was even remotely in the inquiry mode" (p. 11).

Although there is a "national curriculum" based on the selection of textbooks by individual school districts from a common pool, the opportunity to revolutionize social studies teaching through influencing textbook orientation does not seem to be high. (See Schneider and Van Sickle, 1979, for confirmation of this view.) Of course, attempts to influence content should not be abandoned. Some changes have been made in regard to sexist and ethnic biases, and the conceptual adequacy of content might be pursued even more vigorously. Even in doing that, however, it is important to remember that the textbook must inherently be inadequate because of the impossible demands of encompassing so much knowledge--e.g., all of world history or even American history--within a limited number of pages, which do not increase in number as knowledge does (see Metcalf, 1963).

#### What Should Be Done?

An important starting point in considering the role of university professors and curriculum developers in social studies education is an admonition that extreme caution is called for in drawing conclusions about how broadly reform movements affect American social studies education. The general picture of social studies education is one of great stability (also see Ponder, 1979). Although many individual teachers and some individual districts may change rather strikingly in response to reform movements, the great mass of instruction appears to remain largely the same. As professors and curriculum developers, we ought to be cautious that we do not over-estimate the extent to which social studies teachers generally share our orientations and knowledge, and teach accordingly. I have, for example, been quite surprised, in inservice sessions in Utah and Kentucky within the last month, at the extent of teachers' textbook-focused, traditional views of what should be taught in

social studies. The teachers' almost total lack of recognition of the "big names" in the field, such as Kohlberg and even Sid Simon, was even somewhat unexpected. Too often, I believe, professors and curriculum developers base our opinions as to what is going on in social studies on our contacts with "front-running" teachers and districts through consulting work, graduate courses, and interactions at professional meetings, such as this annual meeting of NCSS.

Of course, it is exciting to work with innovative districts and teachers, and I would not want to sound negative toward such efforts. Especially in light of the overall stability of social studies, sustained or intensive work with individual districts or schools takes on special importance. But, an answer to the major question as to what attempts should be made to influence the great mass of social studies education depends to some extent on estimates of likely success. Over-optimism about our influence will only serve to dull the incisiveness and self-scrutiny with which we should approach such questions. And it may deter us from more efforts more limited in scope which may actually have greater potential for pay-off.

The tendency to see the social studies world through rose-colored, or, for some, tear stained, glasses is related to what I take to be the most important issue the NSF reports raise for social studies professors and curriculum developers--do we need to re-examine our own frames of reference? Members of CUFA are perhaps tired of hearing about the "mindlessness" of American education (Silberman, 1970) and, in particular, about the mindlessness of social studies education (Shaver, 1977a). Nevertheless, the NSF report indicates that mindlessness--general lack of thought about purpose and about how method and content affect purpose--should still be a central concern among social studies educators. We should address the need

for careful thought about assumptions at two levels.

Certainly, one level that demands our attention has to do with what goes on in the public schools. Teachers are not very reflective about what they teach or about what they do generally in the school, and about the effects on students. One particularly important example of this comes from the NSF studies of status. On the one hand, teachers are upset by the general lack of student motivation--in social studies, one would have to say the general boredom of students--but, on the other hand, teachers generally do not consider that student attitudes toward school and individual subject area might be a function of the general textbook, recitation, noninquiry, nonparticipatory approach to instruction which predominates. The notion of teacher as philosopher, as an active examiner of questions about aims and the relation of practice to aims, which Dewey (1964, pp. 16-19) advocated (see Shaver, 1977c), has not permeated American education in general, nor social studies education in particular.

The lack of teacher-philosophers leads, in my mind, directly to a consideration of teacher education--the other level where attention to assumptions is badly needed. It is not only that education, pre-collegiate and collegiate, generally tends to be "fact"-laden, with teachers exposed to few examples of scholars inquiring about their fields of study, much less about the assumptions underlying what they do; but that, in my experience, few teacher education programs, undergraduate or graduate, direct themselves explicitly to the task of helping teachers explicate and examine their own assumptions. Philosophy courses, when prospective and in-service teachers do take them, most often seem to focus on learning about philosophy, not on doing one's own philosophy. Curriculum and methods courses tend to be a series of how-to-do-its, with the prospective or in-service teacher exposed

to different techniques and materials, but rarely acquainted with or forced to deal with questions about the assumptions underlying the various techniques and materials and how those assumptions relate to the teacher's beliefs about society, school, and students. Incorporating the doing of philosophy (which is what Dewey advocated)--what I and others have called rationale-building, (e.g., Shaver, 1977b, Shaver & Strong, 1976)--into teacher education does, I believe, have the potential for a major impact on social studies education in this country.

Of course, there is no guarantee that the outcome of teachers philosophizing would be the one which we university professors might desire. But then Dewey (1961) did caution us that if we engage students in thinking, there is a certain danger because we cannot guarantee what the outcome will be.

A proposal to focus on teachers as doers of philosophy also raises a serious question as to when teacher education should occur. I have reservations about our attempts to education people to be teachers prior to their gaining experience as teachers. To ask prospective teachers to think deeply about their aims and the relation of practice to aims prior to real teaching in schools, means that the desired thinking is not likely to occur because the experience necessary for a "felt" problem will be lacking (see, e.g., Dewey, 1933, p. 99, 1961, pp. 155-6). As Dewey (1933, 1961) has cautioned us, we cannot impose problems, and experience and thought lead to learning; if separated, the result is artificiality.

Some teacher education programs, such as our elementary education program at Utah State University, have attempted to cope with that conceptualization of learning by engaging students in instructional-type activities at an early stage in their collegiate careers. For example, at USU, students who intend to major in elementary education are involved in tutoring students as

sophomores, moving toward greater involvement through other activities, culminating with student teaching during their senior year. However, I have reservations as to the effectiveness of such approaches. Is there a substitute for that gross impact of facing, at the elementary level, 25 to 35 students all day long, or, at the secondary level, five to six different classes of 30 to 40 students each during the day over months and years. Although other types of contacts with students may help one to decide whether he or she really enjoys working with youngsters and wants to be a teacher, there is, in my judgment, no equivalent to the "real" classroom. Teachers who have taught for two or more years and faced the problems of management and boredom, I find, are often eager to examine the assumptions from which they are operating, to help students but also to make their own day-by-day existence in the classroom less trying. On the other hand, prospective or neophyte teachers often do not see the significance of questions about aims and about how method and content affect aims.

Shouldn't much less time be put into pre-service teacher education--using it only to prepare teachers for the minimal requirements of lesson planning and classroom management (the latter is probably the more important, and now tends to get very little attention in teacher education programs), saving most of the exposure to various teaching techniques and curriculum methods, as well to a very strong emphasis on doing philosophy, for in-service teachers? This would, of course, require major reorganization of most teacher education programs. But if professors would then use the teachers' experience-based concerns as an entree to the consideration of what can be done to make social studies education more meaningful both to students and the society, the effects on schooling might be quite impressive.\*

---

\*If we take John Dewey seriously, the criteria his writings suggest for judging the appropriateness of instructional-learning arrangements are no more applied, and probably no more difficult to apply, at the university teacher preparation level than has been the case with the inquiry-oriented NSS materials and methods at the elementary and secondary educational levels.

Of course, any discussion of teacher education, including the lack of exposure of prospective and in-service teachers to models of inquiry teaching--must recognize that most of the collegiate education of teachers, at least at the bachelor's level, takes place outside of colleges of education. How to influence the rest of the university, even how to identify noneducation courses that will give education students appropriate intellectual experiences and how to insure that education students take those courses, are overwhelming questions. To a large extent we are caught within a traditional, inflexible institution which is probably not appropriately oriented or organized for the training of elementary and secondary school teachers--nor of university teachers for that matter. But, the recognition of our institutional constraints puts university professors in a position very analogous to that of the public school teacher--a situation which has probably not been frequently enough recognized and dealt with by university professors and curriculum developers in social studies.

Earlier I alluded to two levels at which the doing of philosophy is needed: One is the level of the practicing public school teacher; the other is the level of the practicing university professor and curriculum developer. A further indication of the need for the examination of aims and aim-practice relationships by those of us who are social studies university professor-curriculum developer types struck me in reading the NSF studies and doing the interpretive report. Despite the fact that many professors have excellent working relationships with some teachers and school districts, generally there tends to be a schism between teachers, on the one hand, and professors and curriculum developers, on the other. The cleavage should be of great concern to CUFA members. It suggests that our efforts at examining assumptions may not have been sufficiently prevalent

or incisive.

A major symptom of the schism between social studies teachers and professors and curriculum developers is that teachers perceive the professors and developers as trying to perpetrate views of teaching that do not adequately take into account the realities of the classroom. Social studies professors and developers tend to focus on conceptual structures for instruction and on teaching techniques that we think will not only excite and interest students, but develop their independent thinking (even action) competencies. Teachers, on the other hand, tend to focus on how to manage and control students, with content viewed not only as a tool for attaining cognitive teaching objectives but for managing restless and disruptive students.

One might argue that the teachers' view simply reflects defensiveness and lack of thought, and if they were exposed to the kind of contemplation about purpose and how technique and content affect purpose which I advocated above, they would see the error of their ways and use the freedom that they "really have". I am not convinced that they would, because the assumption of error misses the mark.

University professors and curriculum developers frequently do not have much real-time experience in the classroom. It is one thing to drop in once in a while to teach a class, or even to teach a class for a week or two. It is another thing to teach full days for a few weeks (or, even better, for a year). But this still does not equal the experience of teaching year after year with no escape back to the university or to the curriculum development laboratory. For one thing, university professors and curriculum developers teaching in schools do not need to feel particularly constrained by local institutional limits, except as a matter of courtesy for being allowed into the building or district to try out their ideas. To the contrary,

teachers feel very much constrained by institutional limits--the judgments of other teachers, the principal, students, parents, and the community--for this is the social system which gives meaning to their lives.

If we are to have any great influence on social studies education, or even if our pockets of influence are to be as effective as possible, we need to take into account more carefully the reality of the setting within which teaching actually occurs, and ask more insightful questions about how our innovative suggestions in regard to content and methodology relate to the classroom management and control needs of the teacher. And those needs must be seen not just in the context of having to deal with groups of students, but in the broader context of operating within a social system which controls very important sanctions for teachers. Teachers have not had adequate training in inquiry, reciprocative teaching techniques; so new materials requiring such techniques have made impossible demands. Moreover, we must ask if there is not validity to the teachers' claim that many of the techniques and content orientations of curriculum reformers simply do not recognize the demands of classroom management and of content coverage which teachers face.

In addition, is there not validity to the institution constraints teachers feel? School principals and other teachers stress the importance of orderliness, and one is not judged positively for producing thoughtful, activist students, but for having a quiet classroom and producing students who know how to behave in the next grade. Other teachers, and parents as well, ask for the teaching of content, not for inquiry. And, in fact, parents and other members of the local community are likely to look with suspicion and distaste on the attempts of a teacher to teach students to be critical, outspoken observers of the community or the school. These views

conflict with professors' conceptualizations of citizenship in a democratic society, and consideration of them raises serious questions about what philosophical and psychological balancing of teachers' loyalties--between the desires of the local community, of which they desire to be a part, on the one hand, and the value commitments and policies of the broader society, on the other--is proper. And it raises serious issues in regard to the rights of parents in the education of their children--such as were raised by laypersons during the MACOS controversy but, in my opinion, not recognized and adequately considered by the social studies intelligensia. The explication and exploration of such issues has not had sufficient attention, and is an extensive undertaking beyond the scope of this brief paper.

It seems important to note another basic conflict in views which is one more source of teachers' disenchantment with professors and developers. It can be posed in terms of the dilemma which Berlak (1977) posed well: The conflict which any society faces--but particularly a democratic one such as ours, committed to the involvement of individuals in the important decisions that affect them--between the need for stability and continuity, on the one hand, and progress on the other: The first requiring commitment, and the second requiring creative, critical thinkers. Although the two needs are not completely incompatible, to some extent they place conflicting demands on the schools. People can be both committed and creative and critical. And, of course, commitment underlies creativity and criticality--commitment to certain modes of thought and to values such as openness and truthfulness. At the same time, commitment can be rationally based, as Oldenquist (1979) has argued eloquently. That is, values are--in fact, must be, in a society in which individual dignity is an ideal--rationally justifiable as part of the educative process. Nevertheless, practitioners and

others concerned with schooling may view continuity-progress as a dichotomy, or short of that, may choose to place major emphasis on one or the other.

Social studies professors and curriculum developers tend to be intellectually oriented, or they would not have chosen to work in an academic setting. In my experience, they tend to eschew emotive commitment and feeling as somehow belittling to one with intellectual interests, even ignoring the emotive commitments that underlie their own work. They tend to be liberal--not in the political sense, although perhaps that, too--in the sense of feeling free, and wanting to free others, from irrational constraints on their thought (as in "liberal" education), and in the sense of favoring reform and "progress," especially emphasizing personal freedom and the values of tolerance and open-mindedness. Social studies curricular reforms tend to reflect that orientation. Materials seek to prepare students to think, to analyze and criticize, to be effective demanders of change. On the other hand, social studies teachers, functioning in an order-oriented institution (to what extent, legitimately, because of the demands of coping with large numbers of young people and with a perceived--real?--mandate to socialize the masses to live in and with constraining situations as adults?) and living as members of communities in which the values of conformity and tranquility dominate, tend to gravitate toward continuity end of the dilemma. While university professors advocate the teaching of controversial issues, teachers tend not to be very concerned about such teaching, nor to feel that they are unjustifiably constrained from dealing with such issues. Teachers accept as an important part of their role the socialization of students, in the sense of helping them to learn to get along in institutions that demand conformity. Such socialization in school is seen as important in itself (so that students

will behave in one's own classroom, so that you will not be negatively judged by the principal and other teachers, and, in the context of the total school, because the potential impact of rowdy, out-of-control masses of students is threatening), and as a basis for learning how to get along in life--particularly in the economic domain where employers tend not to like dissident, challenging employees.

Moreover, teachers seem to sense the validity of Myrdal's (1944) reminder that emotive commitment to the basic values of the society is the cement that holds the society together. University professors, from their own academic or scholarly frames of reference, tend to be concerned about the validity of social studies content and with ways to help students learn to investigate the validity of content. Teachers tend to judge the validity of content from a different perspective--that is, does it help to create a positive aura in regard to our country's history and political institutions. Of course, that is not the school teacher's exclusive criterion for content validity; but it is apparently a major one. In this sense, too, the orientations of professors and curriculum developers, on the one hand, and teachers, on the other, are quite discrepant.

Recognition of teachers' orientations in regard to conforming behavior and instilling values is not enough. We must examine carefully the validity of their position, recognizing that it does reflect the desires of the communities in which they teach. That is, the mass of American people (like mathematics and science teachers) do believe that commitment to "American values" is important. Findings such as these suggest to me, unless one takes a completely elitist view that the masses cannot validly comprehend the needs of their own society and subsocieties, that the common assumption among professors and curriculum developers that any instilling of commitment is

unjustifiable indoctrination (see Snook, 1972) must be re-examined. Even Lawrence Kohlberg (Muson, 1979), along with abandoning the Stage 6 level of moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1978; Muson, 1979), has decided that instilling emotive commitment is not only acceptable but essential. (Also see, Oldenquist, 1979, on this point.) My position has been for a number of years--as I believe Oliver and I made quite clear in Teaching Public Issues in the High School (Oliver and Shaver, 1974)--that emotive commitment is not only essential to the survival of the society, but to establishing a context of common affect within which meaningful dialogue, argumentation, and even confrontation, can occur; and that teachers are obligated to support, even instill commitment to, our basic political values, using rational means to the extent possible and increasingly with the intellectual development of students, and avoiding the inculcation of specific value definitions, value judgments, or choices between conflicting values (Shaver & Strong, 1976).

In short, it appears to me that professors of social studies education and curriculum developers may have fallen prey to the same scholacentrism which I, in 1967, attributed to those in the social sciences and history. Again, to refer to Dewey (1933, p. 62), there is a need for us to take care that our scholarly studies and orientations havenot isolated us intellectually from the "ordinary affairs of life" in the schools, with the result that we may have become inept at recognizing the practical state of affairs and in reaching reasonable conclusions about them. Have we become so egotistically engrossed in our own intellectualizing that we fail to comprehend the realistic demands on schools as societal institutions, and thus alienate teachers and isolate ourselves from them (Dewey, 1933, p. 62)? Do we need to be more careful about our assumptions and more self-consciously philosophical about our activities? How do you react to the claim that to reject out-of-hand the teacher's point of view toward conformity and commitment as

irrational, unreasonable, and invalid because it is a response to institutional demands is not only unrealistic, intellectually unsound, and dysfunctional in terms of our efforts to influence schooling, but indicative of our own lack of attention to the matter which should probably engross the greatest proportion of our efforts as educators of teachers--that is, the doing of philosophy and the education of teachers to be doers of philosophy?

In our attempts to influence social studies education, have we paid sufficient attention to the social system within which the teacher operates? It is a social system in which professors and curriculum developers are not very important others, and one that does not provide incentives for innovation and risk-taking. The assurance of a captive clientele and a seniority rather than a merit base for financial remuneration hardly encourage change. The principal, one of the most important persons in the teacher's social system, tends to be geared toward orderliness. And curricular changes that go against the values of the local community (which usually do not include an emphasis on questioning of tradition, dissidence, activism) result in conflict, the very thing which administrators want to avoid (Boyd, 1979). Other teachers, who appear to be the most important source of teaching advice for the individual teacher, look askance on teachers who do new things, especially if it appears that the result will be either students who are harder to control or students who will not "know" the things they need to know in courses that follow--including both "basic information" and how to study from printed material. Students, too, are a conservative influence on teachers. Students come to classes with expectations based on their own past schooling experiences. Attempts to depart from their traditional view of schooling in which teachers have the right answers and students

figure out what those right answers are and feed them back can be disconcerting for students and teachers alike (see Rudduck, 1979).

Perhaps the toughest reality of all is that professors and curriculum developers are not a very important part of the teachers' social system. We have few incentives or sanctions of interest to them. We can lament this state of affairs. We can even ask how we can bypass the apparent constraints. But to do either would be dysfunctional. Teachers do make their teaching choices in the context of the incentives and sanctions of the schooling institution and the broader social system within which they live. The challenge is to consider which of the constraints are legitimate--the other side of that question is, of course, which of our views as university professors and curriculum developers need to be modified?--and to what extent curricular reform as we envision it is possible, and, even more important, desirable. The need for such inquiry on our part, going to the very roots of our professional lives, is the major implication which I see from the NSF studies of status of social studies education.

References

- Berlak, Harold. Human consciousness, social criticism, and civic education. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Building rationales for citizenship education. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.
- Boyd, William Lowe. The politics of curriculum change and stability. Educational Researcher, 1979, 8(2), 12-18.
- Dewey, John. How we think. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1933.
- Dewey, John. Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education. New York: Macmillan, paperback edition, 1961 (first published by Macmillan, 1916).
- Dewey, John. The relation of science and philosophy as the basis for education. In Reginald D. Archambault (Ed.), John Dewey on education: Selected writings. New York: Random House (The Modern Library), 1964, 15-19.
- Hegelson, Stanley L., Blosser, Patricia E., & Howe, Robert W. The status of pre-college science, mathematics, and social science education: 1955-1975. Volume I. Science education. Report to the National Science Foundation on Contract No. C762067. Center for Science and Mathematics Education, The Ohio State University, 1977.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence E. Revisions in the theory and practice of moral development. In William Damon (Ed.), New directions for child development: Moral development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Metcalf, Lawrence E. Research on teaching the social studies. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Moore, John A. A new biology: More relevance, less redundancy. Biological Sciences Curriculum Study Journal, 1978, 1(4), 10-13.

- Muson, Howard. Moral thinking: Can it be taught? Psychology Today, 1979 (Feb.), 12, 46-68, 92.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944.
- Oldenquist, Andrew. Moral education without moral education. Harvard Educational Review, 1979, 49, 240-47.
- Oliver, Donald W. & Shaver, James P. Teaching public issues in the high school. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 1974 (first published by Houghton Mifflin, 1966).
- Ponder, Gerald. The more things change. . . : The status of social studies. Educational Leadership, 1979, 36, 515-518.
- Rudduck, Jean. Insight into the process of dissemination. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1979.
- Schneider, Donald O. & Van Sickle, Ronald L. The status of the social studies: The publishers' perspective. Social Education, 1979, 43, 461-65.
- Shaver, James P. Social studies: The need for redefinition. Social Education, 1967, 31, 588-93.
- Shaver, James P. A critical view of the social studies profession. Social Education, 1977, 41, 300-307. (a)
- Shaver, James P. (Ed.). Building rationales for citizenship education. Washington, D.C., National Council for the Social Studies, 1977. (b)
- Shaver, James P. Needed: A Deweyan rationale for social studies. The High School Journal, 1977, 60, 1977. (c)
- Shaver, James P. Democracy, courts, and the schools. Theory Into Practice, 1978, 28, 279-290.
- Shaver, James P. The usefulness of educational research in curricular/instructional decision-making in social studies. Theory and Research in Social Education, in press.

Shaver, James P., Davis, O. L., Jr., & Helburn, Suzanne W. An interpretive report on the status of pre-collegiate social studies education based on three NSF-funded studies. Report to the National Science Foundation. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1978 (ED 164 363).

Shaver, James P., Davis, O. L., Jr., & Helburn, Suzanne W. The status of social studies education: Impressions from three NSF studies, Social Education, 1979, 43, 150-153.

Shaver, James P., & Larkins, A. Guy. The analysis of public issues: Concepts, materials, research. Report to the U.S. Office of Education. Project No. O-H-011. Logan, UT: Bureau of Educational Research, Utah State University, 1969.

Shaver, James P., & Larkins, A. Guy. The Analysis of Public Issues Program. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973-74.

Shaver, James P., & Strong, William. Facing value decisions: Rationale-building for teachers. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1976.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Snook, I.A. (Ed.). Concepts of indoctrination: Philosophical essays. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.

Stake, Robert E., & Easley, Jack A., Jr. Case studies in science education. Volume I: The case reports; Volume II: Design, overview and general findings. Report to the National Science Foundation on Contract No. C7621134. Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation and Committee on Culture and Cognition, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1978.

Suydan, Marilyn N., & Osborne, Alan. The status of pre-college science, mathematics, and social science education: 1955-1975. Volume II: Mathematics

education. Report to the National Science Foundation on Contract No. C7620627. Center for Science and Mathematics Education, The Ohio State University, 1977.

Weiss, Iris R. Report of the 1977 national survey of science, mathematics, and social studies education. Report to the National Science Foundation on Contract No. C7619848. Center for Educational Research and Evaluation, Research Triangle Institute, 1978.

Wiley, Karen B. The status of pre-college science, mathematics, and social science education: 1955-1975. Volume III: Social science education. Report to the National Science Foundation on Contract No. C7620667. Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 1977.